

JA



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,560	09/30/2003	Scott Edward Kent	DP-310808	6529
7590 02/18/2005				
PATRICK M. GRIFFIN DELPHI TECHNOLOGIES, INC. Legal Staff, Mail Code: 480-410-202 P.O. Box 5052 Troy, MI 48007-5052			EXAMINER ZEC, FILIP	
			ART UNIT 3744	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 02/18/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/675,560

Applicant(s)

KENT ET AL.

Examiner

Filip Zec

Art Unit

3744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,295,832 to Kato et al., in view of U.S. Patent 6,167,720 to Chisnell and U.S. Patent 6,694,773 to Snow et al. In FIG. 2, Kato discloses applicant's basic inventive concept, a condenser (1), having a header tank (6) and a receiver tank (2) attached to said header tank, said receiver tank comprising of end closures (21, 20); a desiccant cartridge assembly (16, 17 and 23) installed within the receiver tank prior to brazing operation (col 9, lines 43-52) comprising of a tube (16) having an open end and spaced apart by a radial clearance (see FIG. 3 and FIG. 7) a desiccant material contained within said tube (23, jacket body), said assembly having a retention clip (16A, FIG. 7) centrally located on the inside tube of the assembly used to center it inside of the outer tube during the brazing process (col 9, lines 30-34), said assembly also containing a filter plug member (22), substantially as claimed with the exception of specifically claiming that the

Art Unit: 3744

desiccant material, filter and end closures are able to withstand the brazing process, and that said filter plug contains a screen disposed within the open end of the tube, which contains the filter plug. Chisnell (FIG. 's 2 and 3) shows the desiccant material being able to withstand the brazing process (col 4, lines 14-23) to be old in the refrigeration art. Snow shows filter (138, FIG. 11) and end closures (38 and 42, FIG. 2) able to withstand the brazing process (abstract), said filter plug contains a screen (142, FIG. 12) disposed within the open end of the tube, which contains the filter plug to be old in the refrigeration art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made from the teaching of Chisnell and Snow to modify the system of Kato, by having desiccant material, filter and end closures to be able to withstand the brazing process, and that a filter plug contains a screen disposed within the open end of the tube in order to make all elements of the system non-detachable via one-shot brazing process and avoid the post-braze assembly (Snow, col 2, lines 23-25). Also, the air tightness of the apparatus is much more improved when elements are brazed together, instead of being detachably assembled (Kato, col 4, lines 20-40).

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 3744

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 5,159,821 to Nakamura, Miki teaches a receiver tank with headers.

Art Unit: 3744

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Filip Zec whose telephone number is (571) 272-4815. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Denise Esquivel can be reached on (571) 272-4808. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Filip Zec
Examiner
Art Unit 3744


CHERYL TYLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

FZ